

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI  
EASTERN DIVISION**

ANTHONY COURTOIS,

Plaintiff,

v.

UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD  
COMPANY, et al.,

Defendants.

)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)

No. 4:22-CV-133 RLW

**MEMORANDUM AND ORDER**

This matter is before the Court on the Motion to Compel Plaintiff's Answers to Written Discovery, filed by Defendant National Railroad Passenger Corporation ("Defendant" or "Amtrak"). (ECF No. 47). Plaintiff Anthony Courtois failed to respond to the motion, and the time to do so has expired. For the reasons that follow, Amtrak's Motion to Compel Discovery is granted.

In its Motion to Compel, which was filed pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 37, Amtrak moves that the Court compel Plaintiff to respond to Amtrak's First Set of Interrogatories and First Request for Production of Documents, which were served on Plaintiff on February 28, 2023. According to the motion, Plaintiff did respond to some of Amtrak's discover requests, however, Plaintiff's answers were insufficient or not complete. Amtrak contends that Plaintiff agreed to answer or supplement a number of Amtrak's discovery requests, but he has failed to do so. Amtrak states that Plaintiff failed to answer and/or supplement Interrogatories Nos. 2, 3, 9 and 10, and Requests for Production Nos. 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14 and 16.

In its motion, Amtrak details its counsel's attempts to resolve the discovery dispute without involving the Court, which included a letter and at least two telephonic communications with opposing counsel. The Court finds counsel has met the requirements of Local Rule 3.04(A).<sup>1</sup>

Finding Amtrak's counsel has met the requirements of Local Rule 3.04(A) and receiving no response in opposition from Plaintiff, the Court grants Amtrak's Motion to Compel. The Court, therefore, will compel Plaintiff to respond and/or supplement his answers to Nos. 2, 3, 9 and 10 of Amtrak's First Set of Interrogatories and Nos. 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14 and 16 of Amtrak's First Request for Production of Documents.

Accordingly,

**IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that Defendant National Railroad Passenger Corporation's Motion to Compel Plaintiff's Answers to Written Discovery is **GRANTED**. [ECF No. 47]. On or before **July 14, 2023**, Plaintiff Anthony Courtois shall respond and/or supplement his answers to Nos. 2, 3, 9 and 10 of Amtrak's First Set of Interrogatories and Nos. 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14 and 16 of Amtrak's First Request for Production of Documents.



**RONNIE L. WHITE**  
**UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE**

Dated this 28th day of June 2023.

---

<sup>1</sup>Local Rule 3.04(A) provides the following:

The Court will not consider any motion relating to discovery and disclosure unless it contains a statement that movant's counsel has conferred in person or by telephone with the opposing counsel in good faith or has made reasonable efforts to do so, but that after sincere efforts to resolve their dispute, counsel are unable to reach an accord. This statement also shall recite the date, time and manner of such conference, and the names of the individuals participating therein, or shall state with specificity the efforts made to confer with opposing counsel.

E.D. Mo. L.R. 3.04(A) (emphasis added).